

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SATISH RAMACHANDRAN,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
CITY OF LOS ALTOS, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. 23-cv-02928-SVK

**ORDER FOLLOWING  
SEPTEMBER 19, 2024 HEARING**

The Court held a hearing by Zoom on September 19, 2024 to address Plaintiff's recent filings, including Dkt. Nos. 120, 121, and 122. Plaintiff and counsel for Defendants appeared. The Court's comments and rulings are as stated in the transcript of the hearing<sup>1</sup>, but a brief summary is as follows:

1. In response to Plaintiff's complaints about defense counsel being given access to materials Plaintiff filed under seal, the Court explained the following procedural points:
  - a. Court filings are presumptively public and a party seeking to seal information must make the necessary showing. However, even if information is sealed, it is sealed as to the public and is not withheld from opposing counsel unless the Court orders more restricted access.
  - b. There is no mechanism under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for a party to ask a court to confidentially investigate another party or counsel. Any request that alleges perceived misconduct must come in the form of a motion supported by facts, and other parties will be given an opportunity to see and respond to the motion.

<sup>1</sup> For completeness of this record, the transcript, to be posted subsequent to this Order, is incorporated by reference.

2. The Court reviewed the chronology of recent events surrounding filings and orders arising out of the City's motion for sanctions and addressed each of Plaintiff's concerns raised in Dkt. 110-111; Dkt. 112-113; Dkt. 120-122.
3. For the reasons discussed on the record, Plaintiff's administrative motion at Dkt. 120 requesting that the Court's August 22, 2024 Final Order on Defendant City of Los Altos' Motion for Sanctions (Dkt. 115) remain entirely under seal is **DENIED**. Only the following portions of page 2 of the order at Dkt. 115 shall remain under seal: portions of lines 10-12, portions of lines 16-17, and portions of lines 20-22. The Court will file a redacted copy of Dkt. 115 on the public docket that conforms to this ruling.
4. Plaintiff's administrative motions at Dkts. 121-122 are **DENIED**. The Court directed Plaintiff to the Federal Pro Se Program should he have any remaining concerns about opposing counsel or the Court following the Court's explanation on the record. The Federal Pro Se Program is available by appointment and on a drop-in basis. The Federal Pro Se Program is available at Room 2070 in the San Jose United States Courthouse (Monday to Thursday 9:00 a.m.–4:00 p.m.) or by calling (408) 297-1480. In addition, the Court offers a pro se handbook free of charge; a copy may be downloaded from: [https://cand.uscourts.gov/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/Pro\\_Se\\_Handbook\\_4-2024\\_MBB.pdf](https://cand.uscourts.gov/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/Pro_Se_Handbook_4-2024_MBB.pdf)
5. Because Plaintiff failed to make the necessary showing as to why sealing Dkts. 110, 111, 112, 113 or Dkt. 122 is appropriate, Plaintiff's motions to seal those materials are **DENIED** and the Clerk of Court is directed to **UNSEAL** Dkts. 110, 111, 112, 113, and 122.

**SO ORDERED.**

Dated: September 19, 2024



SUSAN VAN KEULEN  
United States Magistrate Judge